

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

| KA Code | Knowledge Area | %1862 Extension | %1890 Extension | %1862 Research | %1890 Research |
|--------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 501 | New and Improved Food Processing Technologies | 10% | 0% | | |
| 503 | Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products | 10% | 0% | | |
| 504 | Home and Commercial Food Service | 10% | 0% | | |
| 711 | Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources | 35% | 0% | | |
| 712 | Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins | 35% | 0% | | |
| Total | | 100% | 0% | | |

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

| Year: 2008 | Extension | | Research | |
|---------------|-----------|------|----------|------|
| | 1862 | 1890 | 1862 | 1890 |
| Plan | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Actual | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

| Extension | | Research | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 189125 | 1890 Extension 0 | Hatch 0 | Evans-Allen 0 |
| 1862 Matching 228118 | 1890 Matching 0 | 1862 Matching 0 | 1890 Matching 0 |
| 1862 All Other 884536 | 1890 All Other 0 | 1862 All Other 0 | 1890 All Other 0 |

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)**1. Brief description of the Activity**

ETP 17a: The Food Safety, Preservation and Preparation PPT trained 1428 Food Service workers across the state. A total of 94 classes have been taught by 9 REA's. This training course has a very tough exam at the end of the course and once the individual has passed the test they become certified for 5 years. Of the 1428 completing the class, 80% of the individuals were able to pass the class and become certified.. This year, we offered 5 Serving It Safe classes while training 228 individuals. This course is also offered to line workers to advance their food safety education because the ServSafe certification is not required of all employees, yet the manager recognizes the need for food safety education. Four HACCP classes were taught to Child Nutrition Workers in which 94 individuals were trained. .

2. Brief description of the target audience

ETP 17a: The primary target audience is the food service workers. These workers come from the Child Nutrition Programs, restaurants, grocery store deli operations and other groups that serve food.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**1. Standard output measures****Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods**

| | Direct Contacts Adults | Indirect Contacts Adults | Direct Contacts Youth | Indirect Contacts Youth |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Year | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Plan | 34000 | 142000 | 21000 | 87000 |
| 2008 | 32973 | 2578959 | 16798 | 98753 |

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)**Patent Applications Submitted**

Year Target

Plan: 0

2008: 0

Patents listed**3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)****Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

| | Extension | Research | Total |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Plan | 0 | 0 | |
| 2008 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

V(F). State Defined Outputs**Output Target****Output #1****Output Measure**

This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which are described/explained in the prior "outcome activities and methods sections." The success of many of these outcomes will be formally evaluated/measured by using individual activity evaluation forms designed specifically for each activity, the success of other activities and methods will be measured by the level of participation in the activity. In the target boxes below for each year, we are indicating the number of individual activities within the ETPs for this program area that will be formally evaluated using an evaluation instrument designed specifically for that activity.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| 2008 | 3 | 3 |

Output #2**Output Measure**

ETP 17a: A total of 1428 individuals completed the ServSafe Training Curriculum. ETP 17c: A total of 39 clients were assisted in starting a food business and correct labeling standards. A total of 14 individuals took the Better Process Control Course

| Year | Target | Actual |
|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 2008 | {No Data Entered} | 1481 |

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

| O No. | Outcome Name |
|-------|--|
| 1 | A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training. |
| 2 | Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated. |
| 3 | Food Service Workers Knowledge and Behavior change |
| 4 | Food Entrepreneur Knowledge and Behavior Changes |

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

| Year | Quantitative Target | Actual |
|------|---------------------|--------|
|------|---------------------|--------|

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

| KA Code | Knowledge Area |
|---------|----------------|
|---------|----------------|

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)

Economy

Appropriations changes

Competing Programmatic Challenges

Other (Employee Medical Leave)

Brief Explanation

Two of our Regional Extension Agents (REA) were out on Medical leave for 3 months each which decreased our contact numbers.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

Evaluation Results

ETP 17a: Eighty percent of the individuals taking the ServSafe Exam were successful in the completion of the extensive knowledge exam.

ETP 17c: 39 food Entrepreneurs were able to complete correct food labeling and standards.

Key Items of Evaluation

ETP17a: Rigorous exam to test knowledge. This exam is monitored by an ANSI standards.

ETP 17c: FDA food labeling standards and testing were required for the 39 Entrepreneurial Food Establishments.